

Approved as amended on January 28, 2002

**CALIFORNIA CHILDREN & FAMILIES COMMISSION**  
Advisory Committee on Diversity

October 29, 2001 Meeting  
Library Tsakopoulos Galleria  
828 I Street, Sacramento, California

**Attendance**

**Commissioners:**

Louis Vismara, M.D., Committee Co-Chair  
Sandra Gutierrez, Committee Co-Chair

**Committee Members:**

Brenda Blasingame	Reinaldo Galindo	Irene Martinez	Kate Warren
Portia S. Choi	Javier Guzman	Donna Michelson	Alan A. Watahara
Carlene Davis	Whitcomb Hayslip	Patricia Phipps	Maysee Yang
Rafaela Frausto	Rafael Lopez	Diane Visencio	Lynn Yonekura

**Staff:**

Jane Henderson	Emily Nahat	Barbara Marquez
Jennifer Bell	Nicole Kasabian	Jovanna Gonzales
Roberta Peck		Cecilia Sandoval, Facilitator

**Participants:**

Dorinda Ohnstead	Noe Paramo
Mary Anne Doan	Helen Sanchez

**Welcome and Introduction**

Sandra Gutierrez began the meeting with welcoming remarks and especially welcomed Jovana Gonzales who recently joined the Commission as an Executive Fellow. Ms. Gutierrez remarked that the world had changed since the last meeting and indicated the reason for not meeting in September was because most people opted not to travel so soon after the September 11<sup>th</sup> attack. She found it fitting to take a moment to reflect on the matter, and introduced Diane Visencio who shared a few opening remarks reflecting on the tragedy of September 11<sup>th</sup>. A moment of silence followed. Sandra Gutierrez thanked Ms. Visencio for her comments and asserted that the objectives of Prop. 10 to positively influence lives of children and their families are all the more relevant now.

**Agenda item 1 – Approve June 29, 2001 meeting minutes**

Ms. Gutierrez called for a motion to approve the minutes of June 29<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Rafael Lopez motioned to approve the minutes of June 29<sup>th</sup>, and Ms. Donna Michelson seconded the motion. Ms. Gutierrez asked for any edits or changes to those minutes, and noted that Denise Strongren's name in the minutes changed to Donita Stromgren. The motion was voted on and approved.

Approved as amended on January 28, 2002

**Agenda item 3 – Accept August 1, 2001 meeting summary**

Ms. Gutierrez suggested making a change to the motion to indicate that we would be accepting the August 1<sup>st</sup> summary report instead of approving the report since most members were not in attendance. She recapped that the meeting specifically dealt with the media campaign. She asked for a motion to accept the summary report. Ms. Donna Michelson motioned to accept the report, which was seconded. No changes or comments were made and all accepted the summary report of the August 1, 2001 meeting.

**Public comment on the minutes/meeting summary: None**

**Agenda item 4 – Principles on Equity, Diversity Glossary, & Vision Statement**

Ms. Sandra Gutierrez introduced this agenda item, and asked Barbara Marquez to briefly update the committee on the current status of the issues. Ms. Marquez indicated the committee members were supplied a copy of the final version of the Principles on Equity, The Glossary of Terms, and The Vision Statement. She noted that all three documents were items for discussion and action for both the California Children and Families Association and the State Commission two weeks prior in Santa Cruz, with both bodies endorsing and unanimously approving the documents. She highlighted the most substantial changes to the Principles on Equity since their last meeting (June 2001) was as follows:

1. The last sentence in the first paragraph on the second page reads “For Prop. 10 diversity has been defined to be inclusive of children prenatally to five years of age regardless of immigration status.”
2. Under the first bullet, the word “geographical” was added.

Ms. Marquez also shared that the Equity Principles had been placed on the Association’s agenda three times during late Summer and early Fall. She commended Ms. Blasingame and Mr. Lopez for challenging their membership to take the Equity Principles back to their own Commissions, where they were discussed at the community level.

Mr. Lopez added that in the process of having County Commissions elicit feedback on the Equity Principles that it sparked an interesting debate about what is happening on a local level regarding equity in general. He reinforced that the principles were overwhelmingly well received, and shared feedback for the need to implement tangible effects to bring the principles and the work of the CCFC to life. He remarked that all discussions reflected the respect that the local commissions gave to the work of this committee in thinking through these issues. He noted the overwhelming support not only from the Association, but also from a majority of the local Commissions. Mr. Lopez indicated that they clearly sent the message that the work is not finished with the passage of the Principles. Ms. Brenda Blasingame, chair of the Urban Caucus for the Association, added that the last Urban Caucus Meeting attention was given to brainstorming some concrete methods that the local Commissions could actualize the theory and philosophy of the Principles. She reported the Urban Caucus plans to continue to address and to take leadership in the actualization of the Principles on the local level.

Ms. Gutierrez requested that we track, record, and report on the implementation of the Principles on a local level to identify the successes, the effectiveness, and the uses. She mentioned two examples of use already by the State Commission:

1. The Equity Principles have officially included in the CCFC Guidelines that are distributed to the County Commissions when reviewing and revising Strategic Plans.

Approved as amended on January 28, 2002

2. The Equity Principles have also been incorporated into two recently released RFP's and used as part of the scoring section.

She advised of the danger of passing a document, celebrating its passage, and leaving it in document form, and she encouraged continuing to support the document to higher levels. She opens the item up for discussion. She requested input from the Committee members on other methods of distribution and utilization of the Equity Principles.

- Ms. Kate Warren offered to disseminate the report to parents and promote its support, approval and endorsement from the disability community/systems, Family Resource Center Networks on Early Intervention, a Subcommittee of the State Interagency Coordinating Council on Family Support, etc.
- Ms. Portia Choi requested feedback from Mr. Lopez and Ms. Blasingame on how to best share the Equity Principles with the Local Commissions, specifically with the Commissioners and their Technical Advisory Committees.
- Dr. Alan Watahara suggested the staff produce a cover sheet for the Equity Principles explaining "who, what, where, when and why" so the community can more easily understand the context of the document.
- Ms. Rafaela Frausto, who serves on the Planning Committee for the CCFC Annual Conference, proposed holding focus groups of Association Members and Commissioners at the Conference to get ideas of how to apply the Principles in communities and gather information on the process.
- Dr. Louis Vismara recollected at the onset of the Equity project, the staff researched internally within state organizations and within the state government to see if diversity and equity principles existed, and recalled a relative paucity of such a document. He recommended and encouraged highlighting the Equity Principles as an important document from the state perspective either through the Lt. Governor's Commission for One California, the Governor's office, or through the Legislature, as well as to the foundations.
- Ms. Blasingame suggested that a low literacy level document be produced and presented to everybody and not just policy makers, and make the first translation into Spanish. Dr. Vismara also suggested having a Braille copy available.
- Ms. Diane Visencio asked if the document would be available through the Commission's Web Site. Ms. Marquez confirmed they would be posted there.
- Ms. Gutierrez requested everyone submit names of other organizations to add to the distribution list for the Equity Principles.

Ms. Gutierrez congratulated all involved in the accomplishment of the passage of the Principles, and keeping it real and not just in paper form. Dr. Vismara discussed the State Commission Meeting in Santa Cruz where the audience, staff and other State Commissioners were not only supportive of the Principle concepts, but also referred to them throughout the meeting. He thanked and congratulated Dr. Henderson, Mr. Munso, Ms. Marquez and all the others for setting the stage for these principles so that they are not just abstract ideas, but that they are applicable to our work. Ms. Gutierrez commended Ms. Marquez for her work on the Equity Principles and presented her with a plaque in recognition of her commitment and leadership to the effort.

**Public Comment on the Principles on Equity, Diversity Glossary and Vision Statement:** None

**Agenda item 5 – Central Valley Farm Worker Project**

Dr. Vismara described the Central Valley Farm Worker Project as important because of the unique challenges that the Central Valley represents and the State Commission's commitment to address diversity in that area. The proposal is in the range of \$50 million, which underscored the importance for planning thoughtful approach, an inclusive attitude, and for building and leveraging existing opportunities. This Committee will hear and review this proposal and work with the presenting group to offer thoughtful, constructive input.

Ms. Dorinda Ohnstead, the Executive Director for Kings County Children and Families Commission, introduced Noe Paramo, Executive Director for Stanislaus County Children and Families Commission, and Tony Gastelum and Marta Hernandez, from the Gastelum Group consulting for the Central Valley Farm Worker Project. Ms. Ohnstead informed the Committee that the Proposal is being presented in concept, and is not the final project proposal. She cited the title "Central Valley Farm Worker Demonstration Project, Proposal and Request for Funding," and began the presentation by acknowledging the seven counties collaborating in the project as follows: Kern County, Kings County, Tulare County, Fresno Country, Madera County, Merced County, and Stanislaus County. She described the project as initiating from a presentation on June 19, 2000, at a State Commission Meeting in Hanford where the Commissioners were introduced to the issues associated with the Central Valley. She identified critical needs of farm worker children as follows:

1. Highly identifiable, geographically concentrated population of farm workers.
2. Children with specific, urgent, unmet needs in all areas
3. Significant barriers to access transportation, language, isolated rural locations, culture, etc.

She explained that the seven Central Valley counties along with their Commissioners formalized a regional partnership focused on the farm worker population. In September of 2000, the State Commission awarded them a planning grant for approximately \$50,000. She described the issues related to identifying and achieving an adaptable customer-driven demonstration project. She indicated the consultant was asked to target child health and nutrition, school readiness, and community-based child care, and asked to develop the following deliverables: Potential Funding Partners Report, Economic Feasibility Report, Social Feasibility Report, and finally a Draft Proposal and Request for Funding. She explained that the partnership spent nearly a year finding a consultant, gathering information, and doing the work, leaving only a month to put the presentation together. The pilot project was based on best practices and clear opportunities to leverage other money, not just from the state commission, but also from other key partners. The project guidelines are to be client-driven and responsive to parents' identified needs; delivered to local communities where children live and parents work; services provided in native languages, culturally competent manner; and with tangible, measurable benefits to children's needs

Ms. Ohnstead indicated the Demonstrated Project is a four-year pilot project based on the Promotora service delivery model. She defined a Promotora as a culturally competent individual from a community who is recruited and trained to be a paraprofessional and outreach specialist for their community. She listed qualities and responsibilities of a Promotora as follows:

1. Recruited from local community and neighborhood of the isolated rural towns and labor camps
2. Have an already-established relationship of trust with the target families in those same communities

3. Deliver services and information face-to-face, generally in home around the kitchen table.
4. Home-based, family centered approach where Promotora travels to client.

Ms. Ohnstead explained Promotora training involved understanding existing programs within the community, in the county, and elsewhere in support of children and families; identifying children's needs and barriers; problem-solving and referrals for clients; organizing educational events; and advocating for and addressing the individual needs of a family

She further defined a Promotora as an outreach specialist who can do outreach and education addressing nutrition, prenatal care, breast-feeding, insurance, immunizations and other child health issues. She also listed of other topics and issues that the Promotoras would address: early literacy, enrollment processes, specialized program availability, licensing and training information, language and transportation assistance, etc.

Ms. Ohnstead described key financial partners. She identified job-training partners, specifically the Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs), with significant funds available for training ranging from \$4,000 to \$7,000 per trainee depending on county. She indicated that her local WIB is excited about the program and informed them that more funds would be available if linked to training dislocated farm workers.

Ms. Ohnstead discussed the budget requirements for the project. She stated that the initial conceptual proposal to the State Commission requested \$52 million, a four-year plan to largely support 300 Promotora paraprofessionals throughout the seven counties. She indicated that the Promotoras would be paid a living wage (approximately \$12/hour) with benefits. She explained the reasoning for elevating the paraprofessionals standard of living as important for setting a tone. She stated the evaluation would be a critical component to show that this model could be replicated for other farm worker populations, but for other specific cultural groups. Ms. Ohnstead explained that the governance structure calls for the creation of new 501(c) 3, which would formalize the partnership of the seven member county Children and Families Commissions, with a Board of Directors composed of the executive directors of seven county commissions.

Ms. Ohnstead indicated that their formal request for additional planning funds (an allocation of \$100,000) was set for the November 2001 agenda of the State Commission. Dr. Vismara addressed this issue of calendaring the proposal. Dr. Vismara shared that the Commissioners and audience at the Bakersfield meeting (September 2001) posed many still remaining unresolved questions. He stated that he felt that it was extremely important to move thoughtfully through the process and felt that the Advisory Committee could be of great assistance. He wanted to encourage the Committee to become involved with Ms. Ohnstead and the consultants, acknowledging it as an important function of the Committee to work on this project. Ms. Ohnstead agreed with Dr. Vismara, but insisted that additional funding was necessary to proceed with the planning process. Dr. Vismara clarified the necessity to identify the objectives of the funding, participants of the funding process, and the products to be delivered, affirming this strategy is in the best interest of the children and their families to proceed thoughtfully. He encouraged the Committee to offer their input and recommendations.

- Ms. Michelson asked how soon after initiating the pilot project would it expand to other counties, and identified Tulle Lake as an area with similar statistics to the project area. Ms. Ohnstead said it would depend on funding, full development of the project, and completion of a successful evaluation to move forward.

Approved as amended on January 28, 2002

- Ms. Portia Choi offered volunteering her time to provide input on prenatal, maternal and child health.
- Dr. Lynn Yonekura asked how the health promoters would be supervised and stressed that training should emphasize confidentiality.
- Dr. Vismara raised the issue of how it will interact with the School Readiness Initiative.
- Mr. Javier Guzman commented that enough expertise was available within the Committee to make the project work. He contended that the nuts and bolts, the pro's and con's, and the methodologies were debatable, and insisted on quickly moving forward. Dr. Vismara supported his comment acknowledging the need to move forward quickly but thoughtfully.
- Mr. Whitcomb Hayslip recommended thinking through the supervision of the 300 paraprofessionals, and expressed his concern over the emphasis of connecting people to the child care facilities, and the lack of any direct provision of child care with in that money. He questioned the training and knowledge of paraprofessional toward children with disability issues differentiating them from health issues. Ms. Ohnstead admitted the number one issue from the focus groups for parents of children ages 0-5 was child care, which could not affordably be addressed as part of this project. Mr. Paramo affirmed the child care issue would not be resolved in this discussion, and reviewed possible methods of addressing the solution specifically identifying the demand and creating a model to deliver that service. Ms. Patricia Phipps addressed exacerbating the child care problem by hiring child care providers to fill the paraprofessional positions. Ms. Ohnstead remarked that health is an important issue for farm worker parents and promoting available health services would be a function of the Promotora. She noted that the births of children with disabilities is high among the farm worker population, and informed the Committee that they are developing a partnership with the March of Dimes on prenatal care and education to limit the disabilities. The March of Dimes' curriculum is available both in English and in Spanish. She stated that the Promotora would be trained on available resources and referrals to offer a child with a developmental delay or other disabilities.
- Mr. Reinaldo Galindo commended that Ms. Ohnstead specified a living wage as a benefit as many social workers may not make a living wage. He suggested budgeting for incidental emergency expenditures for the Promotora who may work with a family and identify and meet emergency expenditures.
- Ms. Rafaela Frausto suggested contacting the California Child Care Resources and Referral Network who have a wealth of information, connected in every county with a resource and referral agency, and developed tools for training in Spanish. She suggested having leadership from health, education, and child care within the governance structure for expert advice.
- Ms. Carlene Davis proposed devising a positive statement to the State Commission exhibit support for the project under the Equity Principles. Ms. Gutierrez aside from the governance issues, it was agreed that the project is supported under the Equity Principles. Dr. Vismara related that although the Commission conceptually supported the project, the they felt the project should have been presented to the Diversity Committee as a first step, and urged utilizing and infusing the expertise here for the project.

Mr. Rafael Lopez questioned the Chairs about the Committee's objective in terms of providing direction both to the counties involved in the project, and to the State Commission. Dr. Vismara responded that the most important issues were as follows:

Approved as amended on January 28, 2002

1. Hear about the project
2. Work actively with the Executive Directors and provide input
3. Identify individuals interested in working with the staff to discuss and make further recommendations

Ms. Sandra Gutierrez added that the Commission did request that the Diversity Committee provide input on the project and that we do recognize that it is a project in progress and in need of further assistance from the Committee. Ms. Michelson remarked on the impossibility of the request to be an action item on November 15<sup>th</sup> meeting of the State Commission if the Committee needed to identify individuals to work with the group to give additional input.

Dr. Henderson confirmed Dr. Vismara's question that the Commission had the capacity to provide planning grant funding without a Commission action item, but recommended that there first be agreement on clearly stated goals and objectives of the project and clearly identifiable deliverables as part of their request for additional funds.

Commissioner Gutierrez cautioned that since the project addresses the farm worker population, one of the most vulnerable populations in the state, there needed to be clear outcomes that can be publicized. She identified the fact that a core component of the project is that it is customer-driven, yet the project does not address the primary parental concern, which is child care. She also mentioned that the governance structure appeared to be contradictory. She urged not to interpret the questioning of the project as a lack of support or interest in moving forward with the project, but noted that many gaps exist in this proposal.

Ms. Kate Warren commented on balancing the need for urgency with programmatic and governance issues. She disputed that volunteerism could not continue to support the necessary work to complete the proposal and suggested supporting the planning grant request.

Mr. Alan Watahara suggested the following structural and sustainable issues:

1. Adding the word "children" in the name of the project
2. Conceptually defend the impact the living wage has within the community
3. The importance or relevance of the 501(c)3
4. Questioned the governance structure that only includes Executive Directors

Ms. Ohnstead reminded the Committee that the formal development of the project came into fruition in August with the conceptual presentation of the information to the State Commission with the understanding of working with the Diversity Committee. She told the Committee that key partners needed to be further developed and built into the process, and that \$100,000 is required to address the questions, compete the proposal, and making it the best project it could be. Dr. Vismara commended Ms. Ohnstead for her presentation and supported working on the project and forming a partnership. He asked for a show of hands of volunteers listed below:

Rafael Lopez,	Santa Cruz County,
Rafaela Frausto,	Nevada and Sierra Counties,
Rey Galindo,	San Diego County
Javier Guzman	Fresno County
Donna Michelson	Modoc County
Maysee Yang	Fresno County
Diane Visencio	Ventura County
Portia Choi	Kern County
Kate Warren	Alameda County, also representing children with disabilities

Approved as amended on January 28, 2002

Ms. Dorinda Ohnstead informed the Committee that she would be leaving Prop. 10 soon but hoped to promote the project through her new job at The California Endowment.

Mr. Guzman again expressed his desire for good faith support on the farm worker project and his desire to see it brought before the State Commission as soon as possible.

**Public Comment on the Central Valley Farm Worker Project:** None

#### **Agenda item 6 – Utilization of Data Sources for Children Prenatal to Age 5**

As a result of a presentation given at the last Commission meeting on the draft report from the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) entitled “Demographic Social and Economic Trends for Young Children in California”, Dr. Jane Henderson indicated that the State Commission recommended the Advisory Committee have an opportunity to review the report and discuss guidelines and parameters for the Commission in consideration of California’s diverse population when utilizing data and information sources. She informed the Committee that the Commission had asked PPIC to gather information specifically related to children under the age of 5 and present that to the State Commission to be used for planning purposes. She identified that demographic information as also being important for the School Readiness Initiative, the School Readiness Master Plan Working Group, and the Community Based Outreach Program. She acknowledged issues regarding the sensitivity of the data and how the data is used, alluding to concerns raised and heard by the Commission. She urged discussing these issues, concerns, and how best to use the demographic information to benefit the population. She exemplified the value of the data by revealing that 2/3 of the children under the age of 5 in California are non-white, a fact that is not a well known, and had not been addressed in the school or health care systems. Cecilia Sandoval served as facilitator of this discussion.

Commissioner Gutierrez asked who owned the report and how exactly would the Commission be using the information. Dr. Henderson detailed that the data was public census data compiled specifically targeting children age 0-5 in the CBO program regions and that neither the State Commission nor PPIC planned to publish a report.

Dr. Watahara indicated his concerns as pertained to the utilization of data toward the intended use and the unintended use. He described the second issue to be the reliability and validity of the data to answer all the Commission questions and queries, considering the report was based on census data, which is a source recognized for uncollected data. He indicated the third issue as the opportunity to apply expert data analysis to the report. He summarized that a public data report associated with the Commission may imply its endorsement. Ms. Sandoval synthesized his comments to be 1) utilization of data, intended and unintended, 2) the validity and does it respond to what needs to be known, and 3) since it is a public document related to the Commission, what kind of endorsement does this information receive. Dr. Henderson clarified that the report is not a public document, and specified that only the slides shown and discussed at the Commission meeting were public. She informed that the report had been submitted to the Commission as an internal document. Dr. Watahara shared his concern about the indicators supporting the need for school readiness (based on a deficit model) and expressed the need to define the values in support of a balance.

Commissioner Gutierrez agreed that the data could target certain areas, i.e. areas with lower immunization rates or higher teen pregnancy, but concurred with Ms. Yang that the Asian and Pacific Islander (API) groups are lumped together making the data virtually useless for policy and program use. She suggested that more detail/disaggregated data is needed for the API communities,



Approved as amended on January 28, 2002

and felt the Commission was responsible for gathering and presenting that information. Dr. Henderson reminded the Committee that the PPIC acknowledged the limitations regarding the available API data, and informed them that a more detailed breakdown would be available in under a year. Dr. Choi shared that the Maternal Child Health Branch at the State Department of Health Services could provide data for the geographic and ethnic breakdown by birth for children age 0-5. Commissioner Gutierrez asked if data on disabilities was included in Sonoma State's workplan, and if not suggested investing in that data. Dr. Henderson responded that the lack of methodology existed for identifying these children was an issue, and shared that the School Readiness Working Group recommended developing a screen tool to be used for identification purposes.

Ms. Sandoval suggested clarifying the process of generating data and reviewing incoming data at the Commission as a starting point for the Committee's discussion on recommendations. Dr. Henderson indicated that there is not a standard process and welcomed getting Committee input on identifying:

1. lacking data,
2. data providers,
3. data experts,
4. a process to build checks and balances into data,
5. purpose for the data
6. access to provided data

The Committee provided the following responses:

- Commissioner Gutierrez indicated that the following three recommendations had been identified: the disabilities, an asset based approach, and the API community breakdown.
- Ms. Carlene Davis recommended addressing the African-American population on a community by community basis.
- Ms. Frausto recommended addressing the rural communities in a similar manner.
- Ms. Blassingame expressed her concern on distinguishing children in married households and over representing children raised by a single parent, which leads to a very limited view of family structure.
- Mr. Lopez commented on the decontextualized headings of the PPIC PowerPoint presentation detracting from the richness of the information. He regarded the State Commission formalizing a process or guidelines on data utilization as a secondary issue, and felt that the priority was to acquire data yielding the Commission with the best and most detailed information. He exemplified Santa Cruz County as a wealthy white county, yet Watsonville, one of the poorest areas in the state, with under performing schools, populated by mostly Latino farm workers, was located in the county. He advised for future data issues postponing the agenda item so that a group (like the Advisory Committee) could review the data and/or the presentation. He observed that the data was not sufficient to complete the work required by the Commission, and recommended obtaining feedback, formally or informally, by meetings or e-mail. He commended Dr. Watahara for his initiative in that role and suggested as many reviews of the data as possible before releasing the data/presentation for the public access.
- Dr. Portia Choi specified other sources of information as follows: 1) Maternal and Child Health Branch where data is recorded by zip code and categorized by prenatal care, teen pregnancy, etc. 2) Department of Health Services Children's Medical Services, the California Children Services Profile is limited in that certain eligibility criteria, 3) Regional

Care Systems, 4) Educational Special Needs, and 5) Head Start. She reflected from her work with Asian population, primarily Koreans in Los Angeles, that in the area of mental health and possibly in the area of children with special needs and disability, to “save face” that the Asian community rarely used available outpatient services, but had a higher occurrence of requiring emergency medical attention when the condition became impossible to contain within the family setting. She admitted her hypothesis was not supported by data, but felt it was an issue to explore. Dr. Vismara mentioned a report published by the Hoover Commission on children’s mental health issues substantiating Dr. Choi’s remarks.

- Mr. Lopez commented that in the disabilities/special needs community, people of color have difficulty accessing services in their native language, and alternatively form their own support groups bypassing the regional centers or Early Head Start programs. He suggested investigating the informal networks serving as support for non-English speaking families. Ms. Warren responded by reminding the Committee that these systems at an early age are voluntary therefore understanding the families right to choose whether or not to identify their children as having special needs made the task more challenging, and agreed that as many places as possible should be investigated to see how people self define or identify the needs of their children. She compelled the Committee to do their best to strengthen the child find, make the linkages, account for the know children, and provide information from community resources, especially those families reluctant to choose to receive services from institutions in their counties.
- Commissioner Gutierrez expressed two concerns in relation to the numerical representation of data as exemplified by the African-American community being over represented in the areas of need, but when viewed regionally their statistics are diluted. She asked if a statewide project existed to address this issue, as the numbers are not as powerful as the need might indicate they should be. She observed that other populations shadowed the numbers; a typical problem for the American Indian population. Commissioner Gutierrez inquired what could the State Commission do to ensure that this issue be addressed significantly. Ms. Donna Michelson commented on the assumption that the Black communities are a homogeneous community, and stated that a large portion of the African Americans with mixed racial backgrounds have different problems.
- Ms. Warren suggested reviewing the Equity Principles in regard to the collection, review and presentation of data.

Ms. Sandoval recognized that the discussion required individuals with and without expertise for balance regarding data. She recounted her recent experience in preparing a data report for the City of Los Angeles where one of the major issues was the limitation of data, i.e., the collected data may reflect a negative or limited picture of communities, it may leave some groups out, etc. She listed some ideas of how to move forward on the issues of data and the issues of the process.

#### Issues Toward Limitations of Data:

1. There must be an acknowledgement of the limitations of the data, and that decisions not be made solely based on the data.
2. More work should be done before distributing it to the counties and perhaps it should be linked to the Equity Principles.
3. All the suggestions made regarding disabilities, African American issues, rural families, etc. be identified as the kind of data that should be collected.

Approved as amended on January 28, 2002

4. The Commission provide leadership and influence state agencies in relation to what data is versus what it should be

Issues Toward Process:

1. Issues of interpretation of the data where a researcher would interpret the findings, but the client would work with the researcher on the presentation of the causes of the findings.
2. The client needs to direct the emphasis on a research project and what is sought and how it should be presented.
3. There might be value in establishing a technical data subgroup consisting of technical data individuals and programmatic individuals that could address types of data to be collected.
4. How information is presented and when it is presented is critical to not only to its credibility, but the utilization of the data.

She inquired if the above bullets reflected the tone of the discussion, and summarized that the staff could look further into the data and process issues.

Ms. Sandoval suggested clarifying the role of the Committee regarding data and queried if the role of the Committee was to provide feedback on all the data items before presentation to the Commission rather than after or to screen and provide feedback on the value of the data.

- Dr. Watahara suggested identifying the role of the Committee as a whole and what was appropriate and inappropriate for the Committee to look at, specifying that the Equity Principles and issues related to the principles were appropriate. He thought it was important for those working with the Commission to understand where intervention from the Diversity Committee could be expected, and not after the fact.
- Dr. Vismara did not recollect any data not impacting or not within the preview of the Diversity Committee.
- Ms. Emily Nahat reiterated the importance of including both the programmatic individuals and technical data examiners, and described issues such as the reliability of a particular question, the reporting of data, and the ownership or rights of collected data. She reminded the Committee that this process could potentially be a lot more work, and a lot more meetings to roll out the information for projects to continue.
- Ms. Blassingame suggested being mindful of the reasons for collecting data, of the data's purpose, of the data uses, and of what is gained from the data, to ensure that the collected data represents the purpose for collection. She suggested distinguishing if the purpose was for the data to be useful to the local Commissions or the State Commission. She defined the role of the Committee as reviewing the public's perception displayed by the presented data with particular attention to language (e.g., the negating term "non-white"). She encouraged honoring and promoting the essence and the beauty of cultural differences through language use. She suggested individuals in our organizations or on the community level who works with data from a culturally specific standpoint and have the expertise to review data and provide guidance concerning the data.
- Ms. Martinez recommended creating guiding principles to be applied to the gathering of data and utilization of data.

Ms. Sandoval suggested that at a future meeting, the discussion continue with staff on data collection and a process for reviewing those items with this Committee in order to develop some

Approved as amended on January 28, 2002

basic guiding standards and procedures. Ms. Sandoval further summarized that before presentations are made to the Commission, it was recommended that this group would review it for language, etc., before it is presented where people may react negatively.

**Public Comment on the Utilization of Data Sources for Children Prenatal to Age 5: None**

Break for Lunch and reconvened at 1:15 p.m.

**Agenda item 7 – School Readiness Initiative**

Ms. Emily Nahat introduced Ms. Roberta Peck as the lead staff person in CCFC. Ms. Peck thanked the Committee for embracing the idea of School Readiness as being a core issue for children across the state, and acknowledged the Committee members participation in the design and development of the Initiative. She provided an update on the Initiative. She indicated that 25 of 45 eligible counties have sent in their applications for Implementation Funds. She indicated Orange County Commission applied for the application funds by School Readiness Matching Funds by the first deadline (October 15). Another 20 applications were anticipated for the next application due date of January 15<sup>th</sup>. She informed that staff was developing a review process approved by the Criteria Subgroup as well as the Executive Committee for the Association. She remarked the intention was to have representation on the review team from collegial partners that included: the State Commission, the County Commissions, State Partners, the Advisory Committee on Diversity, and Local Partners. She thanked Mr. Hayslip for representing the Advisory Committee during the first review on October 30. She mentioned that there were six more opportunities to participate in the review process and encouraged participation from the Advisory Committee. Commissioner Gutierrez expressed interest in applying the Equity Principles to the proposal, the scoring, and the actual application, and asked when was the next tier of applications. Ms. Peck specified May 15<sup>th</sup> as the next tier, and indicated that a draft of the Equity Principles was included in the RFF application package released in August.

Ms. Peck continued that outreach, information, and technical assistance efforts were launched with three informational meetings around the state and that future meetings planned to combine information with planning time for the County Commissions to distribute information and exhibit examples. She informed the Committee that teleconferences were taking place every 2-3 weeks with the fifth call scheduled for November 8<sup>th</sup> which allowed an opportunity for the County Commissions and partners to call and ask questions about School Readiness and the funding process. She stated that frequently asked questions (FAQ) were posted on the website. She reported that Technical Assistance is available through mini grants to County Commissions. She also announced working on an interagency agreement with UCLA to provide some additional technical assistance based on an interview survey with all the County Commissions where they were able to identify and prioritize technical assistance needs. The TA strategies included developing a tool kit on working effectively with schools and school districts, and starting the peer mentoring and networking so the County Commissions can share ideas, expertise, models and examples of how School Readiness could look in different communities. She also mentioned that staff are working on a long term RFP for technical assistance.

Ms. Kate Warren asked about the capacity of local community's technical assistance to address the family involvement requirement of the School Readiness RFF and issues involving children with disabilities, acknowledging a tremendous knowledge gap. She questioned the

Approved as amended on January 28, 2002

available resources. Dr. Henderson responded that the RFP was still in development and requested Ms. Warren to submit recommendations and input. Mr. Guzman expressed his concern regarding family involvement, and explained that although his local Prop. 10 Commission sent out an announcement inviting the schools from some of the isolated communities to participate, he questioned how and when families would become involved. Dr. Henderson informed him that family participation was an integral part of the application, and that family and school involvement are critical and essential elements of School Readiness.

Commissioner Gutierrez commented on a letter being sent to superintendents of schools in the School Readiness priority areas on behalf of the State Commission and suggested that other sectors receive the same type of letter, i.e. child care centers, health, social services, etc. to inform their service providers of the five key components of the School Readiness Program. Ms. Peck acknowledged the suggestion and mentioned a meeting in July with partners, i.e. early care providers, state agencies etc. to inform them of the opportunity to collaborate and to distribute School Readiness information throughout their networks. She indicated that these meetings would be held on a periodic basis to keep the partnerships thriving, to share information, and to receive feedback. Commissioner Vismara suggested that a similar letter in content and intent originate from the Department of Developmental Services, the Department of Social Services, Rehabilitation, etc. to issue support from high administrative levels. Ms. Portia Choi commented that Healthy Families was only one component of health coverage and she would recommend including Department of Health Services and its many programs targeted to young children in the distribution of the letter.

Dr. M.L. Yonekura commented that her county decided to implement School Readiness only through the schools. She identified birthing hospitals as another potential site for implementing School Readiness. Ms. Carlene Davis asked if the County Commission would be funded if they were not inclusive. Dr. Henderson encouraged the Committee members to make their views known to their County Commission since the County Commission initiated the effort while the State Commission is a co-funder and partner in the project. She said that a grassroots effort was fundamental to everything about Prop. 10 and the School Readiness Initiative. She commented that the degree of emphasis on school involvement varied from county to county. Dr. Henderson stated the project was not exclusively school based and concurred with the suggestions of following up with other key partners. Ms. Peck assured the Committee that the intent of the School Readiness RFF was to support and evaluate different models. Ms. Peck identified the best and most effective method of addressing the issues brought up was to directly address them to their local Prop. 10 Commissions.

Ms. Peck described the state review process as a consistency check and opportunity for technical assistance from peers and colleagues. She again encouraged Advisory Committee members to participate in the review process to learn more about what the counties are doing, assess technical assistance needs, etc.

Ms. Yang questioned the funding process. Dr. Henderson and Ms. Peck clarified that the county match requirement. Ms. Yang asked if a community-based organization submitting an application also had to match funds. Dr. Henderson explained that the County Commission was responsible for matching the State funds either from its own County Commission funds or from available funds within the community.

Mr. Lopez noted that the School Readiness RFF document explained many of the questions being asked and questioned the availability of the document whereby Ms. Peck confirmed the document was sent to the Committee members the end of July or beginning of August and that it

Approved as amended on January 28, 2002

was posted on the CCFC website ([www.ccfc.ca.gov](http://www.ccfc.ca.gov)). Ms. Peck thanked the Committee for their support, interest and continued involvement in School Readiness Initiative acknowledging their work toward moving the project forward.

#### Cultural and Language Acquisition Technical Assistance for School Readiness

Dr. Jennifer Bell began her presentation by referring to a background sheet on the Technical Assistance (TA) RFP for culturally and linguistically diverse communities and children. The cultural and language acquisition technical assistance RFP is a short term response lasting nine to ten months and consisting of the following components:

1. Provide Data Presentations - Utilize existing local and state data to create user friendly presentations based on Census data and household survey data for counties (EDs, commissioners, etc.) to use as a justification for targeting specific sectors, or for explaining to constituents the reasoning for focusing services in a particular area.
2. Self-Assessment Tools and Instruments – Devise or explore existing tools to conduct gap analysis in the areas of outreach to diverse families in the community and to better assess the county commission's desired and actual capacity to serve diverse communities (e.g., new immigrants, non-literates, multiple needs families, non- English speaking families). Construct self-assessment tools or utilize existing tools to help county commissions examine what they are doing and what they would like to do better. This assessment would comply with the Equity Principles.
3. Promising and Best Practices at the Local Level – Present successful practices used with culturally and linguistically diverse children and families and implemented at a local level. In addition to disseminating the practices to local practitioners, also initiate a dialogue between national or state experts and local practitioners on the application of this information.
4. Assemble a Directory of Resources – To identify the key resource areas, key resource persons at every county level, and some materials that may be particularly useful. The purpose is to broaden the circle of contacts.

She mentioned that the above outlined project would be open for bids from qualified entities probably as soon as January 2002. She indicated that the purpose of the presentation was for the Committee to be aware of the planned work, to comment on the work, to provide feedback, and to discuss other relevant issues. Commissioner Gutierrez informed the Committee that if their organization planned or was considering bidding on this TA RFA that they should not participate in the discussion.

Mr. Guzman commented that a wealth of information and opportunities could come out of the project, but only if there is a diverse response to the RFP. Dr. Bell clarified that the TA RFA would be awarded to a lead contractor with understanding and experience working with diverse communities. It was assumed that no single agency would meet all qualifications, therefore it was expected that one or more subcontracts with expertise in providing technical assistance or in working with diverse populations in local communities would also be involved.

Ms. Blasingame asked for the specific qualifications outlined in the request for bids. She commented that the all-encompassing components of the project invited bids from a university rather than the organizations working at the grassroots level. Ms. Blasingame suggested accepting and encouraging application submissions from grassroots agencies working in communities rather than from statewide agencies or from a conglomerate of contractors. Dr. Bell acknowledged Ms. Blasingame's suggestion for separate bids for separate areas of expertise to be more effective

Approved as amended on January 28, 2002

toward the goal, but she reminded the Committee of the constraints of the state contracting process that require separate contracts to have separate request for proposals, and separate bids.

Ms. Sandoval referred to an example from the Capacity Building Initiative proposed by a group of foundations that solicited for and hired a lead agency/contractor under the condition that they were willing to work with the foundations on the team that was put together. The different categories identified deliverables, tasks, and technical assistance i.e. data, self assessment, best practices, etc. to bid on. The bids went through a rating process based on the specified expertise. She commented the above process was a creative way to accomplish hiring the expertise for the associated components of the project.

Mr. Lopez inquired about the timelines. He questioned the process/timeline for the “data presentation component” and including it in a lengthy RFA process. He emphasized the pressing and immediate need for the data presentations to help complete the process on the local level on the School Readiness Initiative. Dr. Henderson shared that the recently completed GIS mapping program would soon be available in a web-based format, and advised that the technical assistance would not only provide data, but assist in the interpretation and utilization of the data to further the desired outcomes.

Commissioner Gutierrez recommended tracking the results of the Technical Assistance to understand the achievements and its effects.

Ms. Kate Warren expressed her frustration that children with disabilities were not reflected in the handout. She noted that there were only 2-3 modest references within the context of the handout. Commissioner Vismara explained that this project was working in concert with the Sonoma State University Project. Ms. Warren described the confusion surrounding the function, role, and responsibilities of multiple contractors and was skeptical of the full integration of the distinct accomplishments without fragmentation.

Dr. Patricia Phipps expressed her budgetary concerns for including grassroots participation and warning that a lead contractor directing multiple subcontractors would be under funded with a \$500,000 contract, and asked how the budget figures were derived. She commented on the intentions of the proposed timeline and recommended drafting a realistic timeline. Dr. Bell indicated that each deliverable component could take up to a year to complete.

Mr. Whitcomb Hayslip identified the following statistic “In California, Latino and Black males are disproportionately represented in special education classes and identified as learning disabled” as not presented in context and could do some damage, e.g., hurting Child Find efforts in some communities. He recommended disaggregating the comment as it referred to the school age population and was not true of early intervention or preschool services.

**Public Comment on School Readiness:** Ms. Pamm Shaw asked how the proposed technical assistance project differs from the services currently offered to the county commission. Dr. Henderson briefly explained that the different TA services available and emphasized that the proposed TA project focused specifically on cultural diversity.

#### **Agenda item 8 – Positive Outcomes for Children with Disabilities**

Dr. Vismara introduced Ann Carr and Mary Ann Doan, both from Sonoma State University who would present an update on the regional forums: Fresno on Nov. 5<sup>th</sup>, Concord on Nov. 14<sup>th</sup>, and Pomona on Nov. 28<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Doan described the purpose of the forums was to discuss investments for children with disabilities, identify strategic goals, and develop recommendations to the State

Approved as amended on January 28, 2002

Prop 10 Commission. The regional forums would bring together invited participants from a number of groups including service providers (e.g., child care, R & Rs, health), policy makers, institutes of higher learning, state department representatives, and advocacy and parent consumer groups. She indicated that parents constituted 50% of the meeting participants. She explained a fourth and final meeting would be a Synthesis Group consisting of representatives from the three original regional meetings who would compile the information and strategic recommendations gathered from the regional meetings and develop the final recommendations. Following the Synthesis Group meeting, a Recommendation Plan would be drafted and presented to the Diversity Committee, and then to the State Commission for their approval. Ms. Doan shared the planned agenda for the regional meetings. Ms. Doan ended her presentation and responded to questions and comments summarized below:

1. Parent selection was done through a subcontract with Family Resource Centers who contacted parents who had worked with parent advocacy programs, etc.
2. Issues concerning translation needs of parents were raised. Ms. Doan shared that translation services would be available to parents who identified the need at the time of registration. She also indicated that as part of the orientation process that parents who were unfamiliar with the process would be coupled with a facilitator and/or mentor parent to guide them.
3. It was noted that there didn't appear to be any Southeast Asian parents or organizations included in the list of participants. Ms. Maysee Yang state that she had submitted contact information at a previous meeting for a director working with many Southeast Asian families in Fresno County who could have provided a list of potential parent participants. Sonoma State University made a concerted to contact all submitted recommendations, but acknowledged that the process had gone through many hands. Anyone missed would be contacted immediately and invited. Commissioner Gutierrez commented that the situation was not representative of a diverse group and that proactive steps should be made to ensure a diverse representation.
4. Ms. Kate Warren mentioned the challenges encountered and explained that significant changes that occurred since the last meeting and formation of the current list. She described that originally this meeting had been planned as a single statewide meeting with a whole different system in place involving explicitly identified individuals and some parents. She explained that based on feedback from this committee and others in combination with the events of September 11<sup>th</sup> that two major changes occurred: 1) there was a request to increase the number of parent representatives and 2) on short notice the single statewide meeting was eliminated and three regional meetings were established resulting in changed meeting dates. Once the final meeting information was received, the parent groups found it challenging to identify families able to attend a day long meeting on a weekday. She commented that parents, who originally declining to participate, did reconsidered after considerable outreach effort. She indicated that invited participants have expressed confusion regarding the purpose and content of the meetings, and the parents attending have had to compromise their daily schedule i.e. finding childcare for their disabled child. To value parents, she recommended that these input meetings should be planned to accommodate their lifestyle (e.g., scheduled in the evenings with childcare and a meal provided). She explained that the parent groups also planned to submit input from previously held family focus groups concerning family challenges, issues and concerns as it related to young children to represent the parents who could not be present at the regional meetings. She added that



Approved as amended on January 28, 2002

some of their focus groups were held in the participants' native language. Ms. Doan appreciated Ms. Warren's clarification and she assured the Committee that any recommended contacts could still be involved and invited.

5. The Executive Directors from the county commissions shared that they had not been well informed of the meetings and felt they could have been excellent channels in their communities for recommending parents or professional representation to participate in the regional forums.
6. There were also a couple of questions raised and addressed about the Preliminary Results Report developed by Dr. Marci Hanson and Ms. Carr. Ms. Carr reminded the Committee that although the report was distributed at this meeting that they had planned to present it more thoroughly during a subsequent meeting. Ms. Nahat clarified that the report was not a finished product, but consisted of preliminary data to be distributed at the regional meetings.

Dr. Vismara encouraged members of the Diversity Committee to participate in the regional meetings and/or the Synthesis meeting. He also suggested sending out the information gathered at the three regional focus groups to all the members of the Diversity Committee. Ms. Doan acknowledged the suggestions made by the Committee.

**Public Comment on Positive Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:** None

#### **Agenda item 9 – Public Relations and Media Campaign**

Ms. Nicole Kasabian announced that a press conference on Nov. 1<sup>st</sup> would launch the Kit for the New Parents programs statewide and would launch the new paid media campaign. She acknowledged the Committee members' valuable input on the media campaign and the Kit, and indicated each member would be sent a Kit. She mentioned the favorable feedback on the lowered literacy level on the brochures.

Ms. Kasabian gave a quick overview of the framework and context of the Community Based Organization Program. She commented that the ultimate objective for the Public Education Effort was to educate parents and caregivers about the importance of the early years, to provide actions to follow, and to advise of the available local resources. She began by identifying the three components for the Public Education Effort for the California Children and Families Commission and highlighted that each component addressed the objective just in a different way.

1. The Paid Media Campaign is a main component, where brief messages were delivered through paid television, radio, billboard, and newspaper advertisement time to communicate the messages on a broad level and to a wide range of people. The multi-cultural, multi-lingual messages promoted the awareness about the importance of the early years giving parents actionable information to inspire interaction with children. She explained the Paid Media Campaign would have a farther reach than previous, by saturating the state with equal weights of media time for both rural and urban areas. She described the images used in the campaign as reflecting the children of the state including children with disabilities and special needs. She demonstrated the multi-cultural effort detailing the following media resources to be produced in the following languages:
  - Television: English, English with African American focus, Spanish, Cantonese, Mandarin, Korean, and Vietnamese.
  - Radio: English, English with African American focus, Spanish, Cantonese, Mandarin,
  - Print: English, English with African American focus, Spanish, Cantonese, Mandarin, Korean, Vietnamese, Filipino, Cambodian, Thai

Approved as amended on January 28, 2002

- Outdoor Billboard and Bus Shelters: English, English with African American focus, Spanish, Cantonese, Mandarin, Korean, and Vietnamese
- 2. Earned Media or Public Relations is the component of the campaign in which Rogers and Associates assisted in county level and the state level outreach efforts to the news media and advocates with the same objectives described above.
- 3. She indicated the third component of the campaign was the Community Based Outreach Program which focused on reaching communities not addressed in the Paid Media Campaign or the Earned Media Campaign. She acknowledged that the Paid Media Campaign would have approximately a 95% reach in the state, yet some of the people with the highest level of need would not be reached. She described the Community Based Program as a grassroots outreach effort. She explained the CBO Program was structured with a regional approach where regional groups consisting of County Commissions and others would decide the region's funding priorities. She specified the state was divided into ten regions. She detailed the following roles of the Regional Committees:
  - Help determine and develop local priorities
  - Issue the RFPs – A master RFP would be issued which the regional committees could localized and customized to their area
  - Determine the size of individual grants
  - Review applications and select CBO projects

She recounted the program started with the formation of a Task Force which was responsible for guiding the process, providing recommendations for the distribution of funds to the ten regions, determining the key criteria, the scope of work, the overarching program messages, the CBO outreach activities, etc. She provided a roster of the Task Force Members, which includes members from the Advisory Committee on Diversity (Carlene Davis and Rey Galindo), County Commission Association, non-conflicted CBOs, and foundations. Ms. Kasabian explained the Task Force recommendations were given to the State Commission Workgroup that includes Commissioner Sandra Gutierrez, Commissioner Kim Belshe, Jane Henderson and Joe Munso, who made the final determination on the recommendations.

She explained that Rogers and Associates would execute the administrative work, i.e. issue the RFP, develop administrative and financial systems, provide technical assistance to all the CBOs, hire regional representatives (there are already 6 of the 10 in place), monitor the program and collect reports throughout the program. She indicated the initial timeline for releasing the RFP was set for November, but for the process to be inclusive with feedback from the County Commissions and the Diversity Committee, the first release has been delayed to January 2002 resulting in a 20-22 month program.

Ms. Kasabian introduced Ms. Helen Sanchez with Rogers and Associates, who have served as lead on the CBO Outreach Program. Ms. Kasabian also asked Ms. Davis and Mr. Galindo to present the specific recommendations of the Task Force. Commissioner Gutierrez reminded the Committee members not to participate in the discussion if they are planning on applying for funding under this program.

Ms. Davis described the scope of the CBO program as an effort by the "foot soldiers", who have established and trusted one on one relationships with individuals and connections with grassroots groups and organizations. She indicated that the overarching program messages were similar to the Paid Media and Earned Media Campaign. She discussed how the funding was allocated explaining that

Approved as amended on January 28, 2002

1. Each region received an annual \$50,000 baseline amount with an increase relative to the region's birth rate,
2. The regional allocations would range from \$58,000 to \$2.2 million annually,
3. The individual grants would start at \$10,000 over the grant period or \$5,000 per year
4. CBO grant periods ranged from 20-22 months given the new timeline.
5. A contingency fund would be established to finance programs targeted to any population gaps found throughout the state,

She highlighted that the Task Force had discussed Equity Principles with respect to their inclusion in the development of the RFP and that they were evident throughout the RFP and reflected in the evaluation/selection criteria.

Dr. Vismara asked Ms. Sanchez how Rogers and Associates acquired information, expertise, and input with regards to disabilities in the development of the CBO Program. Dr. Vismara expressed his concerns about the RFP being sensitive to issues related to disabilities and inclusive in soliciting the active participation from the disability community.. Ms. Kasabian clarified that the recommendations to date on the CBO Program have been made by the Task Force, which includes Mr. Galindo's participation and guidance. Ms. Kasabian shared that in terms of the RFP outreach, Rogers and Associates was working with the March of Dimes, Easter Seals, SSU, Department of Development Services, members of this committee and others in soliciting names and addresses of agencies serving the disability community. She also stated that Rogers and Associates was working with Sonoma State University as their consultants on special needs and disabilities issues as it applied to all of their work. It had been planned for Sonoma State University (SSU) to assist with the provision of the technical assistance to the contracted CBOs. However she had just been informed late last week (Friday afternoon, October 26) that Sonoma State was recently awarded a large contract and have become unavailable because of resource issues. She stated that Rogers and Associates would need to find new resources to work with. Dr. Henderson further acknowledged that since the Equity Principles were recently officially adopted the ability to officially integrate and embed them into a document would not be unique to this RFP. Mr. Rafael Lopez commented that although Rogers and Associates would administer the program, it would be the regions who would be responsible for contacting organizations with known expertise to apply for a grant. He stressed that County Commissions fought hard to formulate a CBO program because they had the best input into who worked within the target communities at the grassroots level. He referred to the draft RFP noting the work of the Advisory Committee was prevalent and that to respond to the RFP to compete for the grant without addressing the issues raised in the Equity Principles would be futile. Everyone was encouraged to submit names of organizations and groups to be included in the master database for being sent a RFP.

Ms. Davis continued by outlining the CBO eligibility and qualifications. She also shared that the application process was kept simple and flexible to accommodate effective community groups that cannot hire a grant writer. Ms. Visencio commented that some organization might be required to partner with a non-profit organization if they do not have their own 501(c)(3) status.

Ms. Sanchez detailed the specifics of the application process indicating that once an organization submits their application, Rogers and Associates will screen them for completion, then the Regional Review Committee will review the proposals and score them, and finally a selection committee will award the contracts. The Regional Review Committee will include the executive directors from the county commissions, community groups comprised of non-conflicting community-based organizations, and others community representatives (e.g., family organizations

Approved as amended on January 28, 2002

and advocacy groups, representatives from community or statewide foundations, etc.). Commissioner Gutierrez suggested including members of the Advisory Committee in the Regional Review Committee. Ms. Sanchez indicated that any other suggestions regarding regional reviewers could be forwarded to her at Rogers and Associates.

Ms. Sanchez indicated that the selection criteria had not yet been finalized but did cover organizational capability, appropriateness of their program design, linkages to resources and resource development, budget, etc. Ms. Davis shared that the Task Force recommended assigning more weight to the narrative sections (e.g., familiarity with the community, CBOs with a history of integrating and embedding the elements of the Equity Principles into their work, etc.) than to the budget section. Commissioner Gutierrez noted that the criteria seemed very general and needed further specificity to ensure that it was truly the grassroots organizations and groups that were included in the funding decisions. Ms. Davis noted that the selection criteria needed to be more detailed, but acknowledged that the regions needed to be allowed to make the local decisions. Commissioner Gutierrez concurred that the priority areas did need to reflect local priorities, but related that some of the most vulnerable populations have been neglected locally. Commissioner Gutierrez saw this as an opportunity and both a state and regional responsibility to reach those communities. Dr. Henderson expressed the importance of the regions to receive input from a broad spectrum of the community on addressing the selection criteria to ensure the target populations are clearly identified.

Ms. Kasabian inquired if Rogers and Associates were to provide specific data to the regions to help inform their process and their decision making. Commissioner Gutierrez explained that data on target populations/communities that the paid media had not specifically addressed would be an important for the regions. Ms. Davis recommended that Rogers and Associates compile a list of communities reached through the media campaigns and that it be distributed to the Regional Committees for them to begin identifying and addressing the gaps (e.g., communities that have been historically neglected or have not yet been reached through mainstream methods). Mr. Javier Guzman concurred that media message are not reaching the rural isolated areas and acknowledged the challenge of delivering the message to these communities. The Committee mentioned other population groups that fall into this category, e.g., teen fathers, incarcerated parents, etc.

Ms. Kasabian acknowledged Commissioner Gutierrez's request to describe the contingency fund by explaining that \$12 million was available overall for the Community Based Outreach Program for the next 20-22 months from which \$600,000 was reserved for the contingency fund for funding outreach efforts to populations or areas not served after evaluating the extent of the awarded grants. She indicated those funds would be administered through the state rather than the regions, and exemplified that the funds could be used for a specific population not served statewide, or for a specific population not served regionally. Commissioner Gutierrez inquired how those decisions would be made, and Ms. Kasabian indicated that the working group would provide an analysis of the scored proposals disaggregated by audience served.

Commissioner Gutierrez again reminded the members and audience to forward the names of organizations to send the CBO RFP to Helen Sanchez at Rogers and Associates.

**Public Comment of the Public Relations and Media Campaign: None**

#### **Agenda item 10 – Master Plan for Education/Workgroup on School Readiness**

Commissioner Gutierrez recognized the time constraints prevented have this agenda item discussed. She distributed some material highlighting its progress to date.

Approved as amended on January 28, 2002

Ms. Marquez announced that the Committee plans its next meeting around the availability of the Recommendation Plan to be produced by Sonoma State University. She could not confirm a date and expected that the date to be set sometime in December or January.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00pm.